

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/562,840	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DRESSMAN ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> SAMUEL C. WOOLWINE	<b>Art Unit</b> 1637

**All Participants:****Status of Application:** *pending rejections*(1) SAMUEL C. WOOLWINE. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.(2) SARAH KAGAN. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.**Date of Interview:** *21 December 2009***Time:** \_\_\_\_\_**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant     Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes     No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

**Part I.****Rejection(s) discussed:**112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph; 102(e) over Leamon et al (US 7,323,305)**Claims discussed:**all pending claims**Prior art documents discussed:**Leamon et al**Part II.****SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**See Continuation Sheet**Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Samuel Woolwine/  
 Examiner, AU 1637

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner informed Applicant's representative of the new rejections that would be made based on 112, 2nd paragraph and 102(e). Parties discussed possible language to avoid the 112, 2nd paragraph issue, which suggestions are discussed in the Office action mailed with this interview summary.